

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TERRY JEROME CONERLY,
Petitioner,
v.
GAIL LEWIS, Warden,
Respondent.

) 1:02-cv-05462-0WW-TAG HC
)
) ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
) RECOMMENDATION (Doc. 4)
)
) ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR WRIT
) OF HABEAS CORPUS (Docs. 1 & 21)
)
) ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
) TO ENTER JUDGMENT

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

On August 15, 2006, the Court issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the instant petition be denied on the merits. (Doc. 28). The Report and Recommendation was served on all parties and gave the parties thirty days from the date of service within which to file objections. (*Id.*).

20 On September 13, 2006, Petitioner filed a motion to enlarge the time within which he could
21 file objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. (Doc. 29). On September
22 29, 2006, the Court granted Petitioner's motion, extending the time until November 3, 2006. (Doc.
23 30). On October 27, 2006, Petitioner filed the instant second request for extension of time,
24 contending that the individual who is assisting him with his objections has been busy and additional
25 time is required to prepare the objections. (Doc. 31). On November 7, 2006, the Court granted
26 Petitioner's request for additional time, ordering that any objections be filed within fifteen days of
27 service of the order, or by November 27, 2006. (Doc. 32). On November 28, 2006, Petitioner filed
28 his objections.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is supported by the record and proper analysis. Petitioner's objections present no grounds for questioning the Magistrate Judge's analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The Report and Recommendation, filed August 15, 2006 (Doc. 28), is ADOPTED IN FULL;
2. This petition for writ of habeas corpus (Docs. 1 & 21) is DISMISSED; and
3. The Clerk of Court is DIRECTED to ENTER JUDGMENT and close the file.

10 This order terminates the action in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 3, 2006 /s/ Oliver W. Wanger
emm0d6UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE